

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHOCLEF, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

UMER KHALID, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-04221-DMR

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On July 23, 2019, Plaintiff Shoclef, Inc. filed a complaint. [Docket No. 1.] The case was filed by Diego Marguello, who does not appear to be a lawyer, and who purports to represent Shoclef, Inc. An artificial entity like a corporation must be represented by a licensed attorney. Civil Local Rule 3-9(b) (“A corporation, unincorporated association, partnership or other such entity may appear only through a member of the bar of this Court.”); *see also Guifu Li v. A Perfect Day Franchise, Inc.*, No. 10-cv-01189-LHK, 2012 WL 2236752, at *4 (N.D. Cal. June 15, 2012) (“[W]hile pro se litigants can represent themselves, they cannot represent corporations, companies or other artificial entities.”) Here, Marguello is attempting to represent Shoclef, Inc., a corporation. Nothing in the complaint indicates that Marguello is an attorney, that he is licensed to practice before this court, or that he is representing Shoclef, Inc. in his capacity as an attorney. Accordingly, Marguello may not represent Shoclef, Inc. No other person claims to be counsel of record for Shoclef, Inc. Therefore, Plaintiff’s claims may not proceed because as a corporation, Plaintiff can only go forward if it is represented by qualified counsel.

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is ordered to respond in writing to explain why this case should not be dismissed for failure to comply with Local Rule 3-9(b) and section 1915. Plaintiff’s response is due by September 4, 2019.

//

//

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 21, 2019



DONNA M. RYU
United States Magistrate Judge